



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/085,808	02/28/2002	Younes Jalali	68.0303	3260

7590 02/07/2006
Schlumberger Technology Corporation
14910 Airline Road
P.O. Box 1590
Rosharon, TX 77583-1590

EXAMINER

LUU, CUONG V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2128

DATE MAILED: 02/07/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/085,808

Applicant(s)

JALALI ET AL.

Examiner

Cuong V. Luu

Art Unit

2128

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 32-35 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-31 are pending. Claims 32-25 have been canceled. Claims 1-31 have been examined.
Claims 1-31 have been rejected.

Terminal Disclaimer

1. The terminal disclaimer filed on 11/4/2005 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of any patent granted on Application Number 09/952178 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 11/4/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
 - 1.1. The applicants state that Economides et al merely identifies various components of petroleum production systems and considerations to be taken into account in their design and indicate that there is ordinarily only one optimum well trajectory (page 7).

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicants. In claim 1 the applicants claim a method of determining a configuration of a well by:

Receiving input data relating to characteristics of a reservoir and well surface arrangement. On p. 2 paragraph 4, Economides et al recites, "modern techniques such as 3-D seismic and new logging and well testing measurements allow for a more precise description of the shape and the ensuing production character of the well and reservoir" and on p. 581 paragraph 4 "while all offshore operations are generally similar to onshore production operations, certain differences are significant. Production operations from fixed platforms, ships, caissons, etc., are more compact and isolated than their onshore counterpart". These indicate that Economides et al do teach, "receiving data relating to characteristics of a reservoir and well surface arrangement". In addition, on page 1, Economides et al writes (paragraphs 3-4):

Modern formation evaluation provides a composite reservoir description through 3-D seismic, interwell log correlation, and well testing.

Drilling creates the all-important well, and with the advent of directional drilling technology it is possible to envision many controllable well configurations

These paragraphs enforce Economides et al's teaching of a method of determining a configuration of a well.

Selecting a trajectory of a wellbore in the well, a type of interface between the reservoir the reservoir and the well bore, and completion equipment for installation in the wellbore. On p.2 paragraphs 5-7, Economides et al teach that there are 2 trajectories, horizontal and vertical. Based on characteristics of a reservoir, only one is optimum, so a designer has to choose an optimum trajectory for the well based on the reservoir's characteristics. On p. 119

paragraph 1 and pp. 224-227 Economides et al teach components to be selected in designing a petroleum systems as claimed by the applicants.

1.2. The applicants say Economides et al do not disclose a coherent method for the selection of such trajectory, type of interface between the reservoir and the wellbore, and completion equipment for installation in the wellbore, as is disclosed and claim in the present application (page 7).

In claim 1, nowhere can it be found a coherent method for the selection of such trajectory, type of interface between the reservoir and the wellbore, and completion equipment for installation in the wellbore is described. Therefore, this argument is invalid.

1.3. Claims 2, 7, and 14 are argued allowable because of being dependent on allowable independent claim 1, and since Economides et al do not teach features in claim 1, combination of the teachings of Economides et al and Todd et al is not obvious. In response in 1.1, the examiner proves that Economides et al do teach those features in claim 1, so the combination of the teachings of Economides et al and Todd et al is obvious.

1.4. Claims 20, and 22-28 are argued allowable because Economides et al do not teach features as discussed in claim 1 of the independent claim 20 (page 8). As a result, the combination of the teachings of Economides et al and Todd et al is not obvious. In response in 1.1, the examiner proves that Economides et al do teach those features in claim 1, so the combination of the teachings of Economides et al and Todd et al in claim 20 is obvious. Subsequently, the combinations of the teachings of Economides et al and Todd et al for rejecting claims 22-28 are obvious.

1.5. Claims 3 and 4 are argued allowable because of being dependent on allowable claim 1 (page 8), whose features are not taught by Economides et al, even though Donovan et

al do teach features in claims 3-4. Since claim 1 remains rejected as discussed in 1.1, claims 3 and 4 remain rejected.

1.6. Claim 21 is argued allowable because of being dependent on allowable claim 20 (page 9). Since claim 20 remains rejected as discussed in 1.4, claim 21 remains rejected.

1.7. Claims 15-19, and 29-31 are argued allowable because of being dependent on allowable claims 1 and 20 (page 9). Since claims 1 and 20 remain rejected as discussed in 1.1 and 1.4, claims 15-19 and 29-31 remain rejected.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cuong V. Luu whose telephone number is 571-272-8572. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kamini Shah, can be reached on 571-272-2279. The fax phone number for the

Art Unit: 2128

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. An inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC2100

Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CVL

Thay Pham
Thai Pham
Patent Examiner
Art. 2128